

## **REMARKS**

By the present Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 5-7, 12-14, 21, and 24, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof; amends claims 1 and 8 to more appropriately define the invention; and amends claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 to change claim dependencies.

In the Office Action ("OA"), the Examiner suggested amending line 1 of claim 8 to read "protective;" rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kawakami et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,145,691 ("Kawakami"); rejected claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Lin et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,587,342 ("Lin"); and rejected claims 1-4, 8-11, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA").

In response, Applicant amends line 1 of claim 8 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant also cancels claims 5-7, 12-14, 21, and 24, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof, and thus, the rejections of these claims are rendered moot. Further, Applicant respectively traverses the Examiner's rejections. Applicant will address each rejection separately below.

### **I. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kawakami**

Applicant respectfully submits that Kawakami fails to anticipate claims 1-4 and 8-11 because Kawakami fails to teach all the elements of these claims.

In order to properly anticipate Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed., Aug. 2001), (quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d

1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Finally, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 at p. 2100-69.

Claim 1 is directed to a resin encapsulating apparatus comprising a combination of elements including, *inter alia*, “a first drive section which drives [an] extruding section ... and a second drive section which drives [a] squeegee independently of the first drive section which drives the extruding section.” Claim 8 is directed to a resin encapsulating apparatus and includes similar recitations.

In contrast, Kawakami discloses a packing apparatus comprising a nozzle 14 which packs a filler in a through hole 8 and a squeegee 29 which removes an excess filler. Kawakami, Fig. 2. However, squeegee 29 is attached to nozzle 14, and nozzle 14 and squeegee 29 are driven by the same drive section. That is, squeegee 29 is not driven by a drive section other than the drive section which drives nozzle 14.

Thus, Kawakami fails to teach at least the first and second drive sections recited in claims 1 and 8. Hence, Kawakami fails to anticipate claims 1 and 8. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 9-11 are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable claims 1 and 8, respectively.

## **II. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Lin**

Applicant respectfully submits that Lin fails to anticipate claims 1-4 and 8-11 because Lin fails to teach all the elements of these claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a resin encapsulating apparatus comprising a combination of elements including, *inter alia*, “a first drive section which drives [an] extruding section ... and a second drive section which drives [a] squeegee independently of the first drive section which

drives the extruding section.” Claim 8 is directed to a resin encapsulating apparatus and includes similar recitations.

Lin discloses a method for dispensing conductive paste 30 into openings 20 and removing the excess with a squeegee 40. Lin, Fig. 5. However, Lin does not disclose that the paste dispenser and the squeegee 40 are driven by different drive sections. See Lin, col. 3, l. 61 to col. 4, l. 9.

Thus, Lin fails to teach at least the first and second drive sections recited in claims 1 and 8. Hence, Lin fails to anticipate claims 1 and 8. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 9-11 are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable claims 1 and 8, respectively.

### **III. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by AAPA**

Applicant respectfully submits that Lin fails to anticipate claims 1-4, 8-11, 22, 23, 25, and 26 because AAPA fails to teach all the elements of these claims.

Claim 1 is directed to a resin encapsulating apparatus comprising a combination of elements including, *inter alia*, “an extruding section configured to extrude a fluidizing resin into [an] opening of [a] mask.” Claim 8 is directed to a resin encapsulating apparatus and includes similar recitations.

AAPA discloses a conventional resin encapsulating apparatus comprising an extruding device 6 and a squeegee 16. The extruding device 6 and the squeegee 16 are attached to drive sections. However, AAPA discloses that the resin is extruded outside an opening 14 by the extruding device 6 and pushed into the opening 14 by squeegee 16.

Thus, AAPA fails to teach at least "an extruding section configured to extrude a fluidizing resin into [an] opening of [a] mask" as recited in claims 1 and 8. Hence, AAPA fails to anticipate claims 1 and 8. For at least this reason, claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 2-4, 9-11, 22, 23, 25, and 26 are allowable at least due to their dependence from either allowable claim 1 or allowable claim 8.

#### IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 7, 2003

By: 

Bryan S. Latham  
Reg. No. 49,085

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
www.finnegan.com